

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are pending in the above referenced patent application. Claims 1, 14, 26, 29 and 33 are independent.

The examiner uses Corey to reject claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 11 and 26 as having been anticipated.

Claims 1 and 26 recite "a first link weighting process for determining the strength of at least a first link between said first non-directly linked Internet object and a common object," or similar language. Corey does not describe or suggest this quoted claim feature.

The examiner argues that the above claim feature is disclosed by Corey at col. 2, lines 11-46, reproduced below for the convenience of the examiner.

Accordingly, in one embodiment of the present invention, two text search engines are utilized having distinctly different text searching techniques. That is, a first search engine is provided wherein the searching technique includes methods for selecting a first set of one or more particular information items based solely on the literal content of each of the individual information items. That is, the selection of each information item may be accomplished independently of the content of other stored information items. Additionally, a second search engine is provided wherein the search technique includes methods for evaluating the likely relevance of one or more information items based on the analysis of the content of many other stored information items instead of just the individually selected information items. (Corey, col. 4, lines 11-46)

Applicant cannot find the quoted claim feature in the above text or any place in Corey. Corey discloses using two search engines in response to a query and ranking the results from the two search engines into a relevancy list (Corey, see Abstract). Corey fails to describe or suggest "a first non-directly linked Internet object," "a common object," and "a strength of at least a first link between the first non-directly linked Internet object and the common object."

More specifically, Corey discloses a first search engine that includes methods for selecting a first set of one or more particular information items based solely on the literal content of each of the individual information items; no strength of at least a first link between the first non-directly linked Internet object and the common object is described or suggested. Corey discloses a second search engine that evaluates the likely relevance of one or more information

items based on the analysis of the content of many other stored information items instead of just the individually selected information items; no strength of at least a first link between the first non-directly linked Internet object and the common object is described or suggested.

Claims 1 and 26 also recite "a second link weighting process for determining the strength of at least a second link between said second non-directly linked Internet object and said common object," or similar language. For at least the reasons stated above, Corey does not describe or suggest this quoted claim feature.

Corey fails to disclose or suggest any type of link weighting process for determining a strength of a first non-directly linked Internet object and a common object and a strength of a second non-directly linked Internet object and the common object.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 26 are not anticipated by Corey.

The examiner uses Corey and Brown to reject claims 2, 6-8, 12, 14, 16-20, 22-24, 27 and 29-36 as having been obvious.

Claims 1, 14, 26, 29 and 33 recite "a first link weighting process for determining the strength of at least a first link between said first non-directly linked Internet object and a common object," or similar language. At least this quoted claim feature is neither taught or suggested by Corey and Brown, whether taken separately or in combination. Applicant discussed Corey above with respect to the anticipation rejection.

Brown teaches a method in which topically relevant objects are organized under one or more of their respective parents to form a hierarchy level of both topically relevant and structurally relevant sets of objects. (see Abstract) Brown teaches identifying topically relevant objects by known techniques and then identifying structural relationships. Brown fails to teach or suggest "a first non-directly linked Internet object," "a common object," and "a strength of at least a first link between the first non-directly linked Internet object and the common object." Brown fails to teach or suggest any type of link weighting process for determining a strength of a first non-directly linked Internet object and a common object and a strength of a second non-directly linked Internet object and the common object.

Accordingly, claims 1, 14, 26, 29 and 33 are not rendered obvious by Corey and Brown, whether taken separately or in combination.

The examiner uses Corey, Brown and Schuetze to reject claims 5, 15 and 28 as having been obvious.

Claims 1, 14 and 26 are not rendered obvious by Corey, Brown and Schuetze. Claims 5, 15 and 28 depend upon, and add further limitations to, claims 1, 14 and 26. Accordingly, claims 5, 15 and 28 are not rendered obvious by Corey, Brown and Schuetze.

The examiner uses Corey and Whitman to reject claim 9 as having been obvious.

Claim 1 is not obvious in view of Corey and Whitman. Claim 9 depends upon, and adds further limitations to, claim 1. Accordingly, claim 9 is not obvious in view of Corey and Whitman.

The examiner uses Corey, Brown and Whitman to reject claim 21 as having been obvious.

Claim 14 is not obvious in view of Corey, Brown and Whitman. Claim 21 depends upon, and adds further limitations to, claim 14. Accordingly, claim 21 is not obvious in view of Corey, Brown and Whitman.

The examiner uses Corey, Brown and Arthurs to reject claims 13 and 25 as having been obvious.

Claims 1 and 14 are not rendered obvious by Corey, Brown and Arthurs. Claims 13 and 25 depend upon, and add further limitations to, claims 1 and 14. Accordingly, claims 13 and 25 are not obvious in view of Corey, Brown and Arthurs.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this

Applicant : Venkateswarlu Kolluri et al.
Serial No. : 09/902,421
Filed : July 10, 2001
Page : 12 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 10984-540001 / P258

paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

June 8, 2005

Kenneth F. Kozik

Kenneth F. Kozik
Reg. No. 36,572

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906